

IN THE DRAWINGS:

In a Submission of Replacement Drawings filed concurrently herewith, Applicant respectfully requests to amend subscript “n” to --p-- in Figures 1 and 6, and to amend “m” to --n-- in Figures 2 and 8. No new matter would be introduced by this amendment.

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen (US 5,648,793). Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Asada et al. (US 5,867,141). Claims 5, 10, and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. (US 6,075,507). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and further in view of Iino et al. (US 5,900,856). Claims 7-9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and further in view of Asada et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant amends claims 1, 5, and 10. Further, Applicant submits new claims 14-20. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending for consideration. Applicant has amended the Drawings (Figures 1, 2, 6, and 8) and the Specification to correct informalities and typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons. Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display panel including steps of *supplying a first gate start pulse and a second gate start pulse*. To the extent the rejection is applied to claim 1, as amended, Chen fails to teach or suggest at least these steps recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Chen. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[to] anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Asada et al. Claims 2-4 depend from and thus incorporate all the features recited in claim 1. As discussed above, Chen fails to teach or suggest at least the *steps of supplying first and second gate start pulses* as recited in claim 1. Further, Asada et al. also fails to teach or suggest these steps, as recited in claim 1. Thus, Chen and Asada et al., individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the steps of supplying first and second gate start pulses, as recited in claim 1 and incorporated in claims 2-4. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[to] establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Chen in view of Asada et al. be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 10, and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. Independent claims 5 and 10, as amended, each recite *a pre-charging controller to generate the first and second gate start pulses*. To the extent the rejection is applied to claims 5 and 10, as amended, Chen fails to teach or suggest such a pre-charging controller as recited in these claims. Further, Miyahara et al. also fails to teach or suggest the pre-charging controller recited in claims 5 and 10. Thus, Chen and Miyahara et al., individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above feature of claims 5 and 10. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 5 and 10 under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Chen in view of Miyahara et al., and hence the rejection of dependent claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be withdrawn.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and further in view of Iino et al. Claim 6 depends from and incorporates all the features of claim 5. As discussed above, both Chen and Miyahara et al. fail to teach or suggest *a pre-charging controller to generate the first and second gate start pulses* as recited in claim 5, and incorporated in claim 6. Further, Iino et al. also fails to teach or suggest this claim feature. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and Iino et al. be withdrawn.

Claims 7-9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and further in view of Asada et al. Claims 7-9 and 11 depend from and incorporate all the features of either claim 5 or claim 10. As discussed above, both Chen and Miyahara et al. fail to teach or suggest *a pre-charging controller to generate the first and second gate start pulses* as recited in both claims 5 and 10, and incorporated in claims 7-9 and 11. Further, Asada et al. fails to teach or suggest this claim feature. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and Asada et al. be withdrawn.

New claims 14-15 depend from claim 10 and is therefore allowable at least for the same reasons discussed above for which claim 10 is allowable. New claims 16-20 recite features similar to those discussed above and are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: August 7, 2006

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000